IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

MONDAY, THE 23RD JULY 2007 / 1ST SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 20198 of 2007(D)

PETITIONERS:
---

1. KLARAMMA ABRAHAM, FIELD WORKER,
   SCHOOL OF BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES,
   MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O
   KOTTAYAM.

2. SHEELA P.B., FIELD WORKER,
   SCHOOL OF BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES,
   MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS PO
   KOTTAYAM.

3. MOLAMMA.K. ANDREWS, FIELD WORKER,
   SCHOOL OF BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES,
   MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS PO
   KOTTAYAM.

4. SARASAMMA K.P., FIELD WORKER,
   SCHOOL OF BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES,
   MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS PO
   KOTTAYAM.

BY ADV. SRI.BABU VARGHESE

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. MAHATMAN GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR,
   PRIADARSHINI HILLS P.O., KOTTAYAM.

2. THE VICE CHANCELLOR, CHAIRMAN OF THE
   SYNDICATE, MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
   PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O., KOTTAYAM.

BY SRI.T.A.SHAJI, STANDING COUNSEL, M.G.UNIVERSITY

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 23/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

A.K.BASHEER, J.

W.P.(C)No.20198 OF 2007

Dated this the 23rd day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioners are stated to be working as Field Workers in the school of Behavioural Sciences under the Mahatma Gandhi University. Their grievance appears to be that they have been denied the scale of pay which they are legitimately entitled to get in terms of Ext.P6 pay revision order with effect from March 1, 1997. The syndicate thought otherwise, and passed Ext.P7 order rejecting the claim of the petitioners and took the view that petitioners were entitled to get the revised scale of salary only with effect from January 1, 2004 in the scale of pay of Rs.3050-5230. Of course, petitioners have also placed reliance on Ext.P9 series of orders issued by the University in the case of other similarly situated category of workers.

2. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the contentions raised by the petitioners are totally misconceived. The orders in Ext.P9 series do not relate to similarly situated

employees. It is further contended that the decision of the syndicate was totally in accord with the relevant rules and regulations.

3. Anyhow, I do not propose to deal with the various contentions raised by the petitioners in support of their plea that the decision of the syndicate is totally vitiated and illegal, since it is brought to my notice that petitioners have preferred Ext.P8 representation before the Vice Chancellor. Learned counsel submits that petitioners will be satisfied, if an appropriate direction is issued to the Vice Chancellor to take a decision in the matter.

4. In the above facts and circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2 to consider and pass orders on Ext.P8 strictly on its merit and in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. Needless to mention, respondent no.2 shall afford sufficient opportunity for hearing to an authorised representative of the petitioners before any decision is taken

in the matter. Petitioners shall produce a copy of the writ petition along with a certified copy of the judgment before respondent no.2 for compliance.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

A.K.BASHEER, JUDGE

jes